



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/886,054

06/22/2001

Katsumi Kimoto

P 281378
50G31939-USA-AT

5646

909 7590 08/13/2003

PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

ST CYR, DANIEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/886,054

Applicant(s)

KIMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel St.Cyr

Art Unit

2876

H

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,7-13,15 and 17-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,7-13,15 and 17-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/21/03 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-3, 7-13, 15, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sweatte, US Patent No. 6,335,688 in view of Ballantine et al, WO 00/28484.

Sweatte discloses a method and system for airport security comprising: a check-in

Art Unit: 2876

counter 3 for passengers to scan their passport, the passenger is also required to submit to a positive ID check. This ID check is in the form of a fingerprint scan, an eye retinal scan, a hand scan, a palmprint, a hand scan, a finger length scan, or any other positive identification means including DNA or other means for positive identification. After the passenger has had positive ID data taken, a PASS system optionally takes a current photo of the passenger, and presents all the data to a computer database. At this point, the data is checked against Police, department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), FBI, INTERPOL, immigration, customs, postal service, or other databases. If law enforcement databases are remote from the airport, the data can be transmitted by modem, LAN, WAN, Internet, or any data transmission other means (see figures 1 and 2; col. 5, line 56 to col. 6, line 29).

Sweatte teaches that a positive ID is required in order to issue the ticket, but fails to disclose or fairly suggests withholding issuance of the ticket the user is not approved.

Ballantine et al disclose self-service terminal for controlling access to a facility comprising: means for identifying a user before issuing a ticket to the user wherein the ticket is not issued if the user is not approved (see page 10, lines 13-23).

In view of Ballantine et al's teachings, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system Sweatte to authenticate users before issuing tickets to enter the facility. Such modification would provide better security by identifying individuals at the entrance gate so that wanted criminals and would be criminals are identified before entering the facility. Therefore, it would have been an obvious extension as taught by Sweatte.

Re claims 5, 8-10, 15, and 18-20, Sweatte discloses that additional identification check

Art Unit: 2876

points could be installed to perform ID verification, but does not disclose a second check point in a direction reverse from the first direction.

However, having a second check point in a direction reverse is just merely a duplication of element.

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to install a second check point in a direction reversed from the first direction to identify individuals leaving the facility so as to intercept wanted individuals. Furthermore, the specific position and direction of the check point falls within the realm of engineering design choice for meeting specific requirements, which does not provide any unexpected results. Therefore, it would have been an obvious extension as taught by Sweatte.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Maeda et al, US Patent No. 5,987,420, disclose a reservation media issuing system using fussy logic.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel St.Cyr whose telephone number is 703-305-2656. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G Lee can be reached on 703-305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7721 for regular communications and 703-308-7724 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2876

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Daniel St.Cyr
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2876

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Daniel St.Cyr', is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized with loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

DS
August 6, 2003